HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW
VOLUME XLIX JULY, 1956 NUMBER 3

THE AUTHORSHIP OF EGERTON PAPYRUS NO. 3

HENRY CHADWICK
QUEENS' COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, ENGLAND

IN VIGILIAE CHRISTIANAE for November 1955 (vol. ix, pp. 212–217) Mr. Robert Leaney contributed some comments upon the interpretation, reconstruction, and authorship of the sadly mutilated fragments from a codex, tentatively described as a 'Gospel Commentary' when first published by Sir Harold Idris Bell and Mr. T. C. Skeat in 1935 together with the Fragments of an Unknown Gospel. Following the lead of Professor Robert M. Grant (Vig. Chr. ii, 1948, pp. 243–247) he would ascribe the fragments to Origen, but offers different restorations of two sentences, and thinks that a homily is a more probable origin than an early commentary on the Psalms as proposed by Grant.

The following note supports the ascription to Origen common to both Grant and Leaney, and also seeks to elevate the degree of probability attaching to a crucial part of Leaney's conjectural restoration of one sentence.

In Fragment 1, recto, column 1, we have two biblical citations linked together by references to the Holy City. According to the narrative of the Temptation of Jesus (Matthew iv.5) it was the devil who led Jesus into the holy city and set him upon a pinnacle of the temple. And it was also into the holy city that the resurrected saints entered at the hour of the Passion (Matthew xxvii.53). At this point the papyrus becomes fragmentary beyond certain repair. But it is at least probable that the next sentence proceeds to discuss the identity and location of the holy city referred to in the two texts cited or at any rate in the second of them. Leaney acutely suggests that the author is emphasizing that the 'holy city' must not be understood here to mean the

earthly Jerusalem, but the heavenly city of God, invisible from the foundation of the world.

The first comment that may be ventured is that there is a passage in Origen's Commentary on St. Matthew (xii.43, X, p. 169 Klostermann) which is in thought and form almost exactly parallel. The departure of Moses and Elijah from the mount of Transfiguration is explained as a mission to go and disclose to the departed saints in Hades what Jesus had just said in conversation with them; this was in anticipation of the benefits that Jesus himself was soon to confer upon them "at the time of his passion when many bodies of the saints that had fallen asleep were to go into the truly holy city — not the Jerusalem over which Jesus wept." Here is almost the identical adversative comment which Leaney postulates for Egerton Papyrus no. 3.

Origen's exegesis of Matthew xxvii.53 survives only in the Latin version (Comm. Ser. in Matthaeum 139), and does not go far to help us with the interpretation of the papyrus. As so often in this late commentary he is cautious and homiletic in exegesis, far less speculative than in the youthful beginnings of the Commentary on St. John. And on Matthew xxvii.53 he is content to give a characteristic ethical application: this is always true — the saints at all times rise from the tombs of sin and have their citizenship in heaven, so that their light shines before men and they appear to many who see and understand their good works. The section of this Commentary dealing with the Temptation narrative is lost, and the few relevant fragments from catenae printed by Klostermann are of no assistance. On the other hand, it is well known that Jerome's commentaries are deeply indebted to him, and it is no surprise to find Jerome commenting on Matthew xxvii.53 that it was the heavenly Jerusalem to which the risen saints went. More important is his comment on Matthew iv.5 that this text explains what holy city it was which the saints of xxvii.53 entered.[1] If, therefore, Jerome is following his usual practice, it looks very much as though Origen's exegesis of the

[1] Ed. Vallarsi, vii (Venice, 1769), cols. 20 D, 237 C. Jerome treats Matthew xxvii.53 similarly in Epist. 120.8. For his borrowings from Origen see Harnack, Der kirchengeschichtliche Ertrag der exegetischen Arbeiten des Origenes, ii (T.U. 42, 4, Leipzig, 1919), pp. 141 ff.

Temptation narrative treated these two texts as mutually related and explanatory. Origen repeated himself in nothing so much as in the bringing together of a complex of biblical texts which he regarded as relevant to any particular issue. The association of these two texts in the papyrus is at least a signpost towards the authorship.

A second comment on the first column of Fragment 1, recto, is perhaps more speculative: I would suggest that the author's concern is not so much the identity of the holy city as the problem: who may rightly be admitted to it? The two biblical texts are linked not merely by the theme of the holy city as such, but by that of entry to the city. Accordingly, the weight of interest may lie less in the second citation than in the first. For if, as Origen so emphatically asserts (de Princ. iv.3.8), all biblical references to Jerusalem are to be interpreted of the heavenly Jerusalem, Matthew iv.5 might seem to present quite a pretty problem for his exegesis: how could it come about that even the very devil himself could gain access to the holy city? Granted such a hermeneutic principle as Origen lays down, there is no great exegetical difficulty about Matthew xxvii.53. For him it would appear self-evident that the holy city to which the saints went at the time of Jesus' Passion must be the heavenly Jerusalem. But is there such spiritual wickedness in heavenly places that even the arch-fiend can go in and out as he likes?

The way in which such a problem could exercise the mind of Origen is illustrated by de Oratione xxvi.5 where he tackles Eph. vi.12 and explains that since heaven is a state of mind rather than a place Paul's meaning is that wicked powers are fallen in mind; it is inconceivable that they can be actually in heaven.[2]

Admittedly, the interpretation of the Cleansing of the Temple in the Commentary on St. John (x.23 ff.) is forced by exegetical necessities to tell a different story. First, Origen clears the ground by concluding from the discrepancies between the evangelists that the story is quite unhistorical and must therefore be intended to convey profound spiritual truth. The way is now open for

[2] A similar arrière-pensée appears in Origen's comment on Eph. vi.12, preserved in the catena of cod. Coisl. 204 edited by J. A. F. Gregg in J. T. S. iii (1902), p. 572: "The spirits of wickedness inhabit the heavenly place, that is, the air."

allegory, and four interpretations are given. (a) Jerusalem is the Church, which needs purging by Jesus. (b) The Cleansing is the sign that God's providential care has passed from the synagogue to the Church. (c) Jerusalem is the soul, since every soul possesses by nature insight into intelligible realities but needs the light of revelation to purge it of distraction and corrupt teaching. (d) "Perhaps it is the Jerusalem that is above," which, before the ascent of Jesus riding in on a triumphal chariot drawn in double harness by the Church of Jewish and Gentile believers, needed purging of the spiritual wickedness in heavenly places.

In the papyrus text there is nothing to suggest any exegesis as exciting as this last. But that the question worrying Origen is the admission of the devil to the holy city is suggested also by the fact that the two citations about entry to Jerusalem are preceded by a catena of texts about purity of heart in the second column of the verso of Fragment 1. Only the pure in heart can see God. Entry to the city is reserved exclusively for such. The words of the Lord are pure words, purified seven times in the fire; if so, no evil may hope to gain entrance to the place where they may be heard. The quotations from Matthew v.8 and Psalm xi.7 fit perfectly on to this interpretation.

Fragment 2, column 1, is the best preserved piece. Even so, its interpretation is not beyond doubt, as is testified by the remarkably divergent reconstructions offered by Grant and Leaney. Grant is surely right in drawing attention to the parallels in Origen's Commentary on St. John (vi.55–59), where John i.29 is being expounded. According to the gospel text the lamb of God takes away the sin of the whole world, not merely of an elect few. What then of unbelievers? Some have allowed sin to penetrate so deeply into their souls that fire is needed to purge them. Origen's readers are left to draw the conclusion that at the ultimate apocatastasis the entire cosmos will be reconciled to God by Christ. An alternative solution of the difficulty presented by the Johannine text is offered by an unnamed predecessor who, on the ground that the church is an ornament to the world and is said to be the light of the world (Matthew v.14), interprets John i.29 to mean that Christ bears only the sin of the church. Characteristically Origen pays due respect to this exegesis, linking it

to the question whether Christ is the light of the same world as the church, and combining it with his own universalism.

That final restoration for all can be deduced from John i.29 is a theme recurring again in the Commentary on St. John (xxxii.24). It was evidently a point upon which Origen felt strongly.

The text in the papyrus appears to be concerned with a variant form of this problem, namely the antithesis between the Logos as the light of the world and the Logos as incarnate and atoning. How can the universal reference of the first be reconciled with the particularity of the second? "The Logos was made flesh; in what follows John Baptist sees not [. . . .] but Jesus coming to him and says: Behold the lamb of God that takes away the sin of the world." As a lamb he comes forth to be sacrificed — "as it is written, My flesh is true meat and my blood is true drink." But we are not to suppose that the suffering was borne by "the true light . . . who is the beginning, with God, God. This is the true light, a sun outshining our sun. But to whom the Logos, who being in the form of God thought it not robbery to be equal to God, became flesh, to them he is the true light. . ."

The author sees the particularity of the incarnation not as something irreconcilable with the universal and cosmic significance of the Logos, but rather as the way through which that significance is known and appreciated. This is good Origenism.

The verso of the same Fragment 2 is mutilated so far that virtually nothing can be made of it until we reach a mention of "night" and "Zechariah" and a certain citation of II Timothy ii.19 'The Lord knows his own.' Grant rightly observes that this is one of the texts Origen particularly favored. I think he is less happy in the suggestion that the papyrus cited Zechariah xiv.7: 'That day is known to the Lord, and it will be neither day nor night.' I would venture to submit that a far higher probability attaches to Zechariah vi.12: 'Behold a man whose name is *Anatolé*,' a text which Origen not infrequently quotes when there is any question of Christ as the sun of righteousness. A good instance, where the content and even the form of the sentence are not far from those of our papyrus, occurs in the Commentary on St. John, xxxii.24 (Brooke 197, 10 ff.) commenting on John xiii.30 'It was night.' "To those whose feet were washed by

Jesus it was not night, but brilliant daylight. . . . but for the apostate Judas it was night; there was not present to him the man whose name is *Anatolé*. . ."

The antithesis between Christ as the light of the intelligible world and the sun as the light of the sensible cosmos is worked out by Origen in the contra Celsum (v.10–11, cf. vii.31) and also in the Commentary on St. John (i.25–26). In the latter passage (Brooke 31, 10 ff.) it is numbered among the reasons why the sun, moon, and stars cannot be the true light that according to the cosmogony of Genesis they were only created on the fourth day of Creation Week. It is no doubt a long shot, but I would hazard the guess that this is the notion underlying the curious and baffling allusion to the "three days" at lines 89–90 in Fragment 2, recto, column 1. During the first three days of the Creation there was no inferior light in existence, but only the true light of the Logos. (Cf. Theophilus, Ad Autolycum ii.15.)

No explanation of the mention of "three days" is offered by Bell and Skeat. Leaney (loc. cit. p. 216), accepting Grant's hypothesis that the allusion to "Zechariah" implies some citation of Zechariah xiv.7, explains the phrase from the catena fragment on Luke xxiii.44 printed by Rauer as Fr. in Luc. LXXXIII (p. 273), where the prophetic text introduces an exposition of the eclipse at the Passion, in language often verbally identical with Comm. ser. in Matthaeum 134 (XI, pp. 277–78 Klost.), to the effect that the three hours of darkness symbolize the alienation of the Jews from the Trinity of blessed light. The improbability of this view and the difficulty of seeing what it explains seem additional reasons for doubting that Zechariah xiv.7 has anything to do with the papyrus text.

To conclude, the style, argumentation, and grouping of the biblical references in the papyrus are sufficient to make it as good as certain that this 'Gospel Commentary' is a piece of Origen. The actual identification of the work is quite impossible. One guess is as good as another, and in a matter where there is already too much conjecture a little agnosticism may be in place. Leaney (loc. cit. p. 217) thinks the occurrence of the phrase "as it is written" (and similar formulas) favors a homily rather than a commentary. It seems questionable, however, whether this argu-

ment really carries much weight, or indeed whether an examination of Origen's usage would bear out such a statement at all. Be that as it may, the form and content are so thoroughly in the manner of Origen that the theologians must ask the palaeographers to think again about the conclusion that, since the codex is in an early third century hand, his name cannot seriously be considered. Bell and Skeat (Fragments of an Unknown Gospel, pp. 42–44) are confident that the papyrus dates "well before A.D. 250" on account of the close similarity of the hand to P. Oxy. 2082 (late second century), P. Ryl. 57 (late second or early third), P. Oxy. 655 (early third), and others. None of the evidence they give appears to tell decisively against the possibility or even the probability of a date between 225 and 235. But naturally I have no right to an opinion. If, however, the Adversus Haereses of Irenaeus could be read at Oxyrhynchus within fifteen or twenty years of its appearance in Gaul,[3] there does not seem to be any overwhelming difficulty in supposing that Origen's exegetical writings would have found their way in a matter of months or even weeks into the hands of Christian preachers and teachers up country.

[3] P. Oxy. 405, and thereon the remarks of C. H. Roberts, 'Early Christianity in Egypt: three Notes,' in Journal of Egyptian Archaeology 40 (1954), p. 94.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/harvard-theological-review_1956-07_49_3

HERACLES THASIOS

F. SOKOLOWSKI
GOUVIEUX, FRANCE

THE EXCAVATIONS of Thasos conducted with patience and skill by the École Française d'Athènes since 1911 brought to light many important documents enriching largely our knowledge of the political, economic and religious history of this island. Many interesting papers and books have been published on different subjects dealing with ancient Thasos; others are in preparation. It is a real pleasure for the historian of Greek religion to find in these publications numerous documents of a religious character. They are of course fragmentary and difficult to interpret, but nevertheless extremely important. And one must be grateful to the editors for their laborious efforts to present them to us in a comprehensible form.[1]

Since the discovery of the so-called *lex sacra* by Professor Ch. Picard in the prytaneum of Thasos the main subject of study is Heracles. The masterly outline of the organization of this cult as traced by this distinguished French scholar has not been changed by the following discoveries, but some details and precisions were added by the researches and studies of his pupils, Launey and Pouilloux. In my paper on the fees and taxes in the Greek cults I mentioned the Thasian *lex sacra* and in a short statement I suggested how this document should be interpreted.[2] In the present article I should like to attempt to add to this suggestion a certain basis of evidence.

Let us quote this important document: [3]

[Ἡρα]κλεῖ Θασίω
[αἰγ]α οὐ θέμις οὐ-
[δὲ] χοῖρον· οὐδὲ γ-

[1] Ch. Picard, Un rituel archaique du culte de l'Héraclès Thasien, Bull. Corr. Hell. XLVII (1923), pp. 241–274. H. Seyrig, Quatre cultes de Thasos, Bull. Corr. Hell. LI (1927), pp. 185–198. M. Launey, Le verger d'Héraclès de Thasos, Bull. Corr. Hell. LXI (1937), pp. 380–409. R. Martin, Un nouveau règlement de culte de Thasos, Bull. Corr. Hell. LXIV–LXV (1940–1941), pp. 163–200. M. Launey, Le sanctuaire et le culte d'Héraclès à Thasos, Études Thasiennes I, Paris 1944. J. Pouilloux, Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos, Paris, 1954.

[2] Harv. Theol. Rev. XLVII (1954), p. 158.

[3] Ch. Picard, op. cit., p. 242; Suppl. Ep. Gr. II, 505; I G XII, suppl. 414.

[υ]ναικὶ θέμις· οὐ-
[δ'] ἐνατεύεται· οὐ-
δὲ γέρα τέμνετα-
ι· οὐδ' ἀθλεῖται.

The testimonies of Herodotus and Pausanias gave the main basis for the interpretation of this text.[4] The great Greek historian saw in Heracles of Thasos the Phoenician god worshipped in an Oriental manner. The second writer reports the existence in Sicyon of two parallel forms of Heracles' cult, namely of hero and of god, with holocaustic and non-holocaustic rites. The negative prescriptions of the Thasian *lex sacra* should picture the cult of Heracles as a hero. The same regulation with positive rules should prescribe the cult of Heracles as a god. M. Launey found during his excavations in 1937 a lease-document of Heracles' garden in which these positive rules are mentioned.[5] According to our *lex sacra* (in the heroic cult) women are excluded, proceeding expressed by the unknown verb ἐνατεύειν prohibited, cutting of meat for γέρα and ἆθλα abandoned, in other words the whole victim had to be burnt as a holocaust and there was no banqueting after the sacrifice. On the other hand according to the lease-document of Heracles' garden the action of ἐνατεύειν was practised, the cutting of meat for the priest (γέρα) and for the prize of contest (ἆθλα) was done, which means, the banquet followed the sacrifice. Launey in his book on the cult of Heracles in Thasos gives the following sense of our *lex sacra*: "Ici, au prytanée, il est interdit de se livrer pour honorer notre Héraclès Thasien aux pratiques que vous observez ailleurs pour le culte de même Héraclès Thasien." [6]

The Launey book was reviewed in a brief but wonderfully clear article by A. D. Nock.[7] He agrees with the dual character of the cult, because there existed in rites and in conceptions a difference between the hero and the god although the clear limit between them was not severed. In some places Heracles enjoyed the honors of a god, in others he was nothing but a hero. But no Phoenician element is to be seen in his cult which displays a

[4] Her. II, 44; Paus. II, 10, 1.
[5] Bull. Corr. Hell. LXI (1937), pp. 381–382.
[6] Op. cit. p. 138.
[7] Amer. Journ. Arch. LII (1948), pp. 299–301.

purely Greek development. As for the practice of holocaust Nock remarks rightly, it was much less common than is sometimes supposed in a land where meat was scarce. In a brilliant article on the cult of heroes Nock quotes many instances of pure heroic cults in which the banquet (not a holocaust) was celebrated.[8] Many figures considered as heroes received sacrifices offered usually to gods, and many gods, even the Olympians, received holocausts. All that depended on the intention and the purpose of worshippers. The examples reported by Nock relate to old cults going back to the middle of the fifth century B.C. In this early period the banqueting after the sacrifice prevailed.

These important clarifications of Nock were taken into account by Pouilloux in his recent book on the history and cults of Thasos. The *lex sacra* of prytaneum, he thinks, prescribes to honor Heracles as a god while the lease-document mentions the cult of a hero. "Si l'on ne se trompe pas absolument ce fut même l'inverse à Thasos où Héraclès dieu exige le sacrifice complet tandisque le heros accepte de partager avec ses fideles la viande du sacrifice."[9] Consequently, Heracles the god had to be worshipped in the prytaneum and the hero in Heracleion. The *lex sacra* with its negative regulations was a result of a reform done by a famous athlete of Thasos, Theogenes, who became later a divine figure himself.

The interpretation of Launey and Pouilloux are based on vague and doubtful texts of Herodotus, Pausanias and Dion. Our *lex sacra* should be interpreted, I think, in the light of other cult-regulations rather than with the help of vague literary texts. Further, I do not see real opposition between our *lex sacra* and the lease-document of Heracles' garden. In both texts there is a question of the same cult and rite, different only in secondary detail concerning the cutting and the use of parts of victims. The main difficulty in understanding our text is the verb ἐνατεύειν. It figures in the *fasti* of Myconos and in three brief inscriptions of Thasos.[10] According to Stengel and Ziehen it means to cut the meat of a victim in nine parts; the number being characteristic

[8] Harv. Theol. Rev. XXXVII (1944), pp. 145–147.

[9] Op. cit. p. 89, n. 2.

[10] Leg. Gr. Sacr. I, 4, 23–24 (Syll.[3] 1024); I G XII, suppl. 353, 414. Pouilloux, op. cit., p. 32, nº. 10.

of the cult of the underworld gods and heroes.[11] This symbolic interpretation seems to me unnatural and unclear. I conjecture, the verb in question denotes to cut nine or ninth parts for a banquet and a consumption after the sacrifice. The partition of meat is often mentioned in the regulations of the cult. The portions very carefully cut in even pieces were called *μερίδες, μοῖραι, μέρη, λόγχαι.*[12] Several times a weight of portions is prescribed: 10, 5 or 2 *minae*, or generally: *τρίτα μέρη, διμοιρία, δύο κρέα, τρεῖς, ἐννέα σάρκες, πεμπάς.*[13] According to the statutes of the foundation of Poseidonios of Halicarnasse the meat of the victim has to be cut in "even portions" for the men and women taking part in a banquet after the sacrifice.[14] In Athens during the Panathenaia a fixed number of portions was cut for different staffs of officials.[15] The verb *ἐνατεύειν* should relate to the cutting of meat for some body of officials. Indeed, such a fashion of cutting, as we see in our *lex sacra*, is attested by Athenaeus. The victim after the sacrifice to Dioscouroi in Athens was cut in three parts: (1) for so-called *parasites*, (2) for priest and (3) as a reward given to the winners in contests.[16] These three portions are expressed in the Thasian *lex sacra* by the terms: *ἐνατεύειν, γέρα, ἆθλα.* It is difficult to decide if the body of men receiving the nine portions or ninth parts of the victim represented the government of Thasos, or the *parasites* of Heracles, or both. The *parasites* are witnessed in many cults, but especially in that of Heracles.[17] The lease-

[11] Leg. Gr. Sacr. I, p. 17; Syll.[3] 1024 n. 18. Cf. Stengel, Opferbräuche, p. 132.

[12] Leg. Gr. Sacr. II, 29, 11 foll.; My Lois sacrées de l'Asie mineure nº. 39, 24. Cf. nº. 32, 56; 70, 6.

[13] Cf. F. Puttkammer, Quo modo Graeci victimarum carnes distribuerint, Königsberg 1911, p. 15 foll.

[14] My Lois sacrées nº. 72, 41–44.

[15] Leg. Gr. Sacr. II, 29, 11 foll.

[16] Athen. VI, 235 b: *τὸ μὲν τρίτον μέρος εἰ τὸν ἀγῶνα, τὰ δὲ δύο μέρη, τὸ μὲν ἕτερον τῷ ἱερεῖ, τὸ δὲ τοῖς παρασίτοις.* Cf. Jahresh. VIII (1905), p. 161, l. 18 foll.

[17] Cf. Ziehen, RE XVIII (1949), pp. 1378–1380. F. Deneken, De Theoxeniis, Berlin 1881, p. 26. Gruppe, RE, III Supplb. (1918), p. 924; Hug, RE XII (1924), p. 1109. Eitrem, Symb. Osl. X (1932), pp. 37–38. A. D. Nock, Harv. Theol. Rev. XXXVII (1944), p. 152, n. 40. The sale-contract of the Heracles priesthood of Chios contains the following stipulation: If the priest is absent, the others called *ὧν αἱ λόγχαι* replace him in assisting the sacrifice, Leg. Gr. Sacr. II, 113, 12–13. The term *λόγχη* is explained by the lexicographers as "portion, part," which is received at banquets. The above mentioned substitutes seem to be *parasites* of Heracles. Diodoros the comedian informs us, that in a certain city, probably Athens, 12 men were chosen for the celebrating of the banquet of Heracles, Athen. VI, 229 d. The *parasites* were familiar figures in the cult of Heracles in Kynosarges, Athen. VI, 234 e. In the cult of Athena Pallenis there were three *parasites* chosen

document of Heracles' garden mentions the preparation of seven sofas (κλῖναι) for seven persons who had to take part in a banquet after a sacrifice to Heracles. If we withdraw the priest, the minimum number of banqueters was six. This figure can embrace the archonts, the theores or the *parasites*. The number of *parasites* corresponded usually to the subdivision of people in familial or political groups. Pouilloux' penetrating study teaches us in fact that the people of Thasos were divided in πάτραι whose number was three or the multiplication of three.[18] I think that the nine or ninth portions mentioned in the *lex sacra* of Thasos were reserved for the representatives of people. After these remarks we can attempt to understand the general character of our *lex sacra*. The epithet of god, Θάσιος, has nothing particular, it is given to other gods of Thasos also.[19] The interdiction of offering a goat and a pig is nothing Oriental, it was common to many Greek cults for a different reason, but not least because the people disliked to eat the meat of these animals.[20] The exclusion of women was customary where the guests, the men, were resting on sofas.[21] The new element in the *lex sacra* concerns the partition of the meat of victims. The inscription regulated the traditional ξενισμός of Heracles in the governmental building called prytaneum. Here was the usual place in all Greek cities where the receptions in honor of men and gods were prepared.[22] The *lex sacra* regulating the entertainment of Heracles in the prytaneum has nothing to do with the cult of the same god in

---

from the demes, Athen. VI, 234–235 (Cf. R. Schlaifer, Harv. Stud. in Class. Philol. LIV (1943), p. 35–66). They helped in collecting the contributions for the feast and took an official part at the banquet. According to the so-called king's law, they received portions from the parts of meat reserved to them and banqueted in the temple. Incidentally I should like to suggest the following reading of Athen. VI, 235 c: *τοὶς δὲ παρασίτους ἐκ τῆς βοὸς κοιλίας ἐκλέγειν ⟨καὶ μερίδας⟩ ἐκ τοῦ μέρους τοῦ ἑαυτῶν ⟨καὶ⟩ ἑκτέα κριθῶν.* For the κοιλίαι cf. Syll.[3] 1025, 51; Arist. Equit. 160; Plut. 1169. I suggest also the following reading in the lease-document of Heracles' garden of Thasos, I G XII, suppl. 353, 10: *ὅπως ἂν . . . ἐ]νατευθῆι· ὅτι δ'ἂν ἀπόσταθμον γίνηται, τῶμ μὲν [ἐξαιρεθέντων τῶι ἱερεῖ καὶ τοῖς . . . τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν δώ]σει τοῖς πολεμάρχοις.*

[18] Op. cit., p. 369.

[19] I G XII. 8, 361.

[20] Cf. Th. Wächter, Reinheitsvorschriften, p. 83, 87.

[21] Cf. Syll.[3] 1024, 9. My Lois sacrées n°. 42, A 3; 72, 41.

[22] Cf. Athen. IV, 137 e. Perhaps the reading *εἰς τὰ ἀρχεῖα*, Athen. VI, 235 c, should be retained. It seems to be an allusion to the ξενισμός of Apollon. Cf. R. Schlaifer, op. cit. p. 61.

his shrine in Heracleion. Just about the date of this regulation (as the excavations show) the Heracleion with a big altar, a portico and rooms, was built.[23] I should therefore like to think that after the construction of these buildings the main celebrating of the feast in honor of Heracles was transferred from the prytaneum to the Heracleion.[24] For this reason the distribution of meat to officials, to the priest and to the winners of contests was discontinued. In the prytaneum there took place the traditional ξενισμός of god in which the whole victim was consumed without charges for officials, priest and winners at games. The difference between these two cults consisted in the fashion of partition of meat which was used for the banquet after the sacrifice. We do not know if the ceremonies in the prytaneum and in Heracleion were celebrated at the same time or at different feasts. The first possibility seems to me to be more probable.[25]

Pouilloux is right in stressing the rôle of Theogenes in this early period of the history of Thasos. But in regard to his cult reform, I am rather sceptical. It is difficult to distinguish what is legend and what history, one is only certain: the case of Theogenes is the most ancient in the history of deification of living men. Yes, as the documents prove, Theogenes had a real cult in Thasos.[26] What was its reason and origin? Eitrem in his remarkable study on the apotheosis quotes several examples of the Θεοξένια in which living men assumed the rôles of gods.[27] So behaved Philip, Alexander, Ptolemaios, Antonius, many generals and Roman emperors. At the banquets in honor of gods they were usually garbed and entertained as gods. Eitrem is correct in presuming that the *parasites* existing in different cults represented the gods at the banquet ceremonies. The apotheosis of Theogenes could therefore originate from the rites of theoxenia of Heracles in which the famous athlete played the rôle of god.

[23] Pouilloux, op. cit. p. 97.

[24] During the Θεοξένια in Paros a public banquet was prepared for the people, I G XII, 5, 129.

[25] I see the same details in the fragmentary regulation of Heracles' cult in Milet, My Lois sacrées n°. 42, A, B. In the text A we see the interdiction of eating: οὐ βρῶσις. In the text B the sacrifice of ox supposes the banquet. The interdiction seems to prohibit the public banquet not the ξενισμός of Heracles.

[26] Bull. Corr. Hell. LXIV–LXV (1940–1941), p. 166f.

[27] Symb. Osl. X (1932), p. 38.

THE GOTHIC EVIDENCE FOR "EUTHALIAN MATTER"

JAMES W. MARCHAND
WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

IT IS a well-known fact that, sometime between the 4th and 7th centuries, a recension of the NT, or at least of the Pauline and Catholic epistles, into thought-lines was made. This recension is attributed variously to Euthalius, to Evagrius, even to Pamphilius.[1] In spite of the fact that its authorship is unclear, this recension into thought-lines, along with certain other matter which is normally found with it, is traditionally called "Euthalian matter" or "Euthalian apparatus." There are two important problems concerning Euthalian matter which are at present unsolved: (1) the date of Euthalius (or of the author of the recension, whom I shall henceforth call Euthalius for convenience sake); (2) which parts of the Euthalian matter are to be ascribed to the original author?

The date of Euthalius has long been a subject of controversy, and several dates have been proposed by competent authorities. Von Soden thought that Euthalius could not have lived before the 7th century, and that Euthalian matter could not be earlier.[2] Robinson placed him in the 4th century.[3] Since the Greek manuscripts showing the Euthalian apparatus are all rather late, the answer to the question of the date of Euthalius has been sought in the versions. Armenian evidence, demonstrating the existence of Euthalian matter in the late 5th or early 6th century, has been cited by Conybeare.[4] Syrian evidence pointing to the same date

[1] E. von Dobschütz ("Euthalius Studien," ZfK XIX, 2) was, as far as I know, the first to place quotes around the name Euthalius. A. Erhard first proposed Evagrius as the author of "Euthalian Matter" (Centralblatt für das Bibliothekwesen (1891) VIII, 385–411). To my knowledge, E. Nestle is the only scholar who suggested Pamphilius as the author: "In any case, this ms. (H) is our principal witness for the recension of Pamphilius or, as it used to be called, the recension of Euthalius" (E. Nestle, Introduction to the Criticism of the Greek N.T., trans. by W. Edie, London, 1901, p. 188 f.).

[2] H. von Soden, Die Schriften des NT, 1902, Vol. I, 637–682.

[3] J. A. Robinson, "Euthaliana," Texts and Studies, No. 3, Cambridge, 1895; "Recent Work on Euthalius," JTS VI (1904–05), 87–90.

[4] F. C. Conybeare, "The Date of Euthalius," ZfnW V (1904), 39–52; "On the Codex Pamphili and the Date of Euthalius," The Journal of Philology XXIII (1895), 241–259.

has been cited by von Dobschütz.[5] Von Soden's dating and the theory stemming from it seem thus to have been disproved; the earliest dating for which we have any good evidence seems to be the 5th century; Robinson's dating (4th century) is based on conjecture. Any precision brought into our dating of Euthalius must be welcomed by textual critics.

The only edition of the Euthalian apparatus we have at present is that of Zacagnius (in the year 1698). It goes without saying that this is neither accurate nor complete in the highest degree, since new finds and new methods have changed many ideas in textual criticism since Zacagnius' time. Dr. J. A. Robinson attempted to ascertain which parts of the Euthalian matter were authentic and which later additions, and his theories for a time found general acceptance. The uncertainty as to the date and the provenience of Euthalius, as well as an over-emphasis on the evidence of Codex H of the Pauline epistles, leaves much of his work questionable. The pressing problem in the study of Euthalius today is, as it was in Robinson's time, to separate the old, genuine Euthalian matter from later additions.[6]

It is remarkable that the Gothic version has not been discussed in the previous treatments of Euthalius, since, in my opinion, it offers evidence of the most unimpeachable sort both as to the date of Euthalius and as to the Euthalian apparatus as it must have been originally. A discussion of the extant Gothic manuscripts of the NT with this in mind will serve to illustrate the point.

All the Gothic Codices Ambrosiani are usually considered to be of the 6th century, and, though our dating of the Gothic manuscripts is uncertain, there is little reason to doubt this. All are palimpsests, and all are known to have been in Bobbio, though there is reason to doubt that they were written there.[7]

Codex Ambr. A is therefore a manuscript of the 6th century,

[5] Von Dobschütz, op. cit., and Centralblatt für das Bibliothekwesen X (1893), 49–70.

[6] New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge IV (1909), 215 b–216 a (by von Dobschütz): "A greater difficulty is that of reconstructing the true text used and approved by Euthalius."

[7] Cf. Michiel van den Hout, "Gothic Palimpsests of Bobbio," Scriptorium VI (1952), 91–93. See also the present author's "Notes on Gothic MSS," to appear in JEGPh.

certainly not later than ca. 550.[8] It seems to have been written in Italy, and it exhibits Latin influence in the form of its *S*, in its use of a suspension mark for both final $-m$ and $-n$, and in its use of a ligature for *nd*. The first part of the manuscript (from Romans 6, 23 to I Cor. 5, 4) is written in a colometric arrangement reminiscent of the Greek Codex H, that is, with the cola and the commata indicated by indentations. The rest of the manuscript is written in scriptura continua, but with the divisions still indicated by spaces and points. The double point (colon) is not used in Ambr. A. On the border of Ambr. A, numbers agreeing in the main with the Euthalian capita of Zacagnius' edition are found.[9] A number of marginal glosses also appear in the border of A.

Codex Ambr. B is usually thought to have been written in North Italy, but its script is more archaic than that of A and is closer to the Greek from which the Gothic alphabet doubtless issued.[10] B has a Greek form of the letter *S*, suspension for final $-n$ alone, and no ligatures. In fact, it seems that the scribe of B misunderstood suspensions for $-m$ and the ligature for *nd*.[11] It should perhaps also be noted that the abbreviations for nomina sacra in B have a different form from those in the other manuscripts.[12] Codex B has the same division into cola as Codex A, except that the cola here are marked by two points (:) and the

[8] The destruction of the Visigoths at the hands of Byzantine generals has always been the *terminus post quem non* for Gothic scholars. It seems extremely unlikely that any Gothic manuscript could have been written down after 555.

[9] W. Braun, "Die Lese- und Einteilungszeichen in den gotischen Handschriften der Ambrosiana in Mailand," ZfdPh XXX (1898), 433–448, gives an excellent discussion of the punctuation and division of the Codices Ambrosiani, along with new readings of these codices. See further Fr. Kauffmann, "Beiträge zur Quellenkritik der gotischen Bibelübersetzung. 7. Der codex Carolinus," ZfdPh XLIII (1911), 401–428, and W. Braun, "Ein satzphonetisches Gesetz des Gotischen mit vorwiegender Rücksicht auf die Codices Ambrosiani," Germanisch-Romanische Monatschrift V (1913), 367–391. My discussion is based in the main on these three articles. It should be mentioned that scholars are not agreed on the value and correctness of Braun's readings.

[10] On the origin of the Gothic alphabet, see S. Fairbanks and F. P. Magoun, "On Writing and Printing Gothic," Speculum XV (1940), 313–330; O. von Friesen and Anders Grape, Om Codex Argenteus, Uppsala, 1928, pp. 87 ff.; also the author's article, "Der Ursprung des gotischen þorn-Zeichens," PBB 77 (1955), 490–494, and "Das akrophonische Prinzip und Wulfilas Alphabet," ZfdA (1956), 34–42.

[11] See the author's, "Two Alleged Late-Gothic Sound-Changes," to appear soon in JEGPh.

[12] Ludwig Traube, Nomina Sacra, Munich, 1907, 271–275.

commata by a single point (·). B is written throughout in scriptura continua. Where A and B have the same text, they are to a great extent in agreement in this division, except that A indicates the cola by spaces. In addition to the agreement with one another, the reconstructed Vorlage of A and B would agree remarkably well with Codex H of the Pauline epistles in the matter of cola and commata.[13]

Besides this division into thought-lines, B evinces a fourfold division of the text:

1. 44 sections marked with the word *laiktjo* (doubtless borrowed from the Latin *lectio*), often with a number added.
2. 68 (perhaps 79) sections with only a numerical sign.
3. A division sign of the first order (93 places).
4. A division sign of the second order (170 places).[14]

Of the sections marked with *laiktjo*, 26 agree with the *lectiones* of Zacagnius; in the other 18 cases, the *laiktjo* differs only by a few verses. The numerical signs agree in 44 cases, disagreeing in the other cases only by a difference of one to three verses. The purpose of the division signs of the first and the second order is at present unclear; until we have exact information as to the appearance of these signs and their place in the manuscript, this must remain the case. Of the 28 numerical signs in A, 20 agree with those in B. There seems to be little doubt that the Vorlage of A and B, which must be placed in the 5th century, had a division into cola, along with the Euthalian *lectiones* and *capita*, and that the few differences are the result of scribal errors.

Probably the most curious of the Gothic manuscripts is the Codex Carolinus in the library at Wolfenbüttel. This codex, which is a Latin and Gothic bilingual, is set up on the page in the following manner: [15]

[13] Kauffmann, op. cit., p. 406 ff.

[14] W. Braun, "Lese- und Einteilungszeichen," pp. 435 ff.

[15] Cf. Kauffmann, op. cit., p. 406. The first two lines are separated by ca. 1 cm., the second two lines by ca. 1 cm.; the third and the fourth vertical lines are separated by 6.5 cm.; the other lines are separated by 1 cm. each. The Latin begins in the eighth column, and is displayed on its side of the page in the same manner as the Gothic. The Gothic and Latin words are, of course, not separated; they are separated here for convenience.

| | | |

listing of OT citations, such as we often find in Euthalian manuscripts, into the text. It seems possible that the above mentioned Vorlage of A and B also had Euthalian OT citations. Since none of our MSS has the beginning of the Pauline epistles, we cannot be sure whether the Euthalian colophon or the tables were present.

It is normally considered that Euthalius first made a recension of the Acts, the Pauline and Catholic epistles, but that the division of the Gospels into thought-lines came later. In view of our Gothic MSS of the Gospels, this idea may have to be revised.

The Codex Argenteus is a manuscript of the early 6th century. It is written in gold and silver letters on purple parchment in a type of hand (the straight pen) which can scarcely go back past the late 5th. It contains fragments of the Gospels in the Western order and has the Eusebian or Ammonian sections indicated in the margin and in arches at the bottom of the page. It is generally supposed to have been written in Northern Italy, and Latin influence is seen in the forms of the Gothic letters and in the use of a suspension mark for $-m$. It uses as punctuation marks the colon (:) and the comma (·); the colon is used to mark the beginning of each section, the comma to set off the smaller divisions. In addition, gold letters are also used as a sort of punctuation device, since the letters after each colon (up to the end of the line) are written in gold. The divisions formed by the comma are irregular and seem to be drawn up according to the sense, i.e. are thought lines; it seems quite impossible to consider these divisions to be stichometric.[17] In addition to these divisions, the paragraph sign is also used. In general, the division of the text signaled by the paragraph sign is the same as the one signaled by the Eusebian numbers in the margin. This is not always true, however, and the paragraph seems to have been an entirely different sort of division from the Eusebian section.[18]

Codex Ambrosianus C contains parts of Math. 25 to 27. It too is written in thought-lines; the colon (:) marks the larger section, the comma (·) the smaller. Numerous small numbers and signs which are unexplained appear in this codex. Its script is some-

[17] Cf. Braun, "Ein satzphonetisches Gesetz," p. 375.

[18] Cf. O. von Friesen and Anders Grape. Codex Argenteus Upsaliensis Iussu Senatus Universitatis phototypice editus, "Praefatio," pp. 38, 57 f.

what different from that of the other codices; it is generally supposed to be from the 6th century. There is considerable disagreement between the divisions of C and those of the Codex Argenteus where they have the same text. The divisions of C do not seem always to follow the thought. The two versions agree as to the end of the verse and the beginning of the verse, however; their cola agree every time.

The Giessen fragment is a fragment of a Gothic-Latin bilingual, containing parts of Luke (L 23, 11–14; L 24, 13–17). It has the Eusebian sections noted in the margin in the same manner as in CA, but we have no way of knowing whether the arches were set at the bottom of the page or not, since that part of the pages we have is lost. It was written in the same style as the Codex Carolinus, i.e. the larger divisions (cola) were signaled by the fact that the line was not indented, the smaller divisions (commata) by indentation. Evidently the page was written in the same manner as our Greek codex H. The script of the Giessen fragment reminds us of that of Ambr. C. The manuscript has been dated as early 5th century by palaeographical evidence, as dating from before 408 by external evidence.[19] As is seen by the form of the *S*, this codex was written in the slant pen style, whereas most of our Gothic manuscripts are written in the straight pen style. The form of the *S*, however, reveals Latin influence and is certainly later than the form of the *S* in Ambrosianus B. It seems likely, therefore, that the MS cannot be as early as 408. It has been placed by one authority in the 6th century.[20] From the palaeographical standpoint, the 6th century seems too late, so that the manuscript is most probably of about the middle of the 5th century. Thus, not only do we find evidence of a colometric arrangement of the Pauline epistles in the 5th century, but evidence also of a colometric arrangement of the Gospels according to thought-lines.

In addition to the evidence previously cited, it should be mentioned that Codex Ambrosianus D, containing fragments of Nehemia, as well as Ambr. E, containing a Gothic commentary on

[19] Paul Glaue and Karl Helm, "Das gotisch-lateinische Bibelfragment der Universitätsbibliothek zu Giessen," ZfnW XI (1910), pp. 10 ff.

[20] M. H. Jellinek, Geschichte der gotischen Sprache, Berlin, 1926, p. 15.

parts of the Gospel according to John, are both written in thought-lines, with the same division signs as the other manuscripts which are written scriptura continua. This type of division of texts seems thus to have been productive among the Goths, not just a dead tradition.

Thus far, we have cited no evidence earlier than approximately the middle of the 5th century as to the date of Euthalian matter. The following points, however, should be noted: Wulfila was a lector before he was made bishop and should have known well the advantages of a text divided in the Euthalian manner; the Gothic bible evidently was designed for ceremonious reading; all our Gothic manuscripts are written *per cola et commata*, the oldest having indentation instead of punctuation marks. In view of these facts, it seems likely that the writing *per cola et commata* and the colometric arrangement goes back to Wulfila himself, rather than having been introduced by some later Gothic scholar. We do know, to be sure, that there was a later recension (?) of the Gothic bible undertaken, since the preface to the Codex Brixianus indicates this, and this recension has been attributed to the two Gothic clergymen, Sunnia and Frethela, who wrote St. Jerome asking for information on the text of Psalms. In view of the strong aversion to any kind of innovation expressed both in the preface to the Codex Brixianus and in Sunnia and Frethela's letter, however, it seems unlikely that such a thorough-going revision as a transformation into thought-lines would have been made by the authors of this new "critical edition". Even if we do assume that the authors of this new recension introduced the writing in thought-lines, this must place Euthalius in the early 5th century. We would thus have certain evidence placing Euthalius in the early 5th century (ca. 405–410), thus antedating any certain evidence hitherto cited. If it is true, as some scholars seem to believe, that the "new edition" of the Gothic bible must be placed before 408, then we must at least place Euthalius at the end of the preceding century, and 396 may even seem too late a date. If we assume that the practice derives from Wulfila, we must place Euthalius well into the 4th century (Wulfila died ca. 383), probably in the first half of the 4th century. The fact that the Euthalian colophon mentions that its text is a copy of

one in the library of Pamphilius at Caesarea, and that Wulfila had strong ties to the church at Caesarea should be mentioned.

Thus, the Gothic evidence appears to antedate any previous evidence as to Euthalian matter. Since the Gothic appears also to be the oldest extant representative of the Lucianic or Antiochian text, its witness must be respected. Any attempt to reconstruct the Euthalian apparatus as it must have existed in the autograph must take the Gothic evidence as its basis. The first requisite of such a study is a re-investigation of our Gothic manuscripts, with a view to determining with certainty their witness as to Euthalian matter.

AN ORDINANCE AGAINST IMAGES IN JERUSALEM, A.D. 66

CECIL ROTH
Oxford University

The problem of the attitude of Judaism towards art and images, at the beginning of the Christian era, has again come to the forefront of scholarly enquiry as a result of the publication of the first volumes of E. R. Goodenough's monumental work, Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period (vols. 1–3, New York 1953; vol. 4, New York 1954). In these learned pages, every particle of evidence bearing on the subject is carefully considered, and the author emphatically confirms as fundamental to his main thesis the accepted view: that at least up to the destruction of Jerusalem in the year 70, there was a completely effective Rabbinic ban on any sort of iconographic representation for whatever purpose. (His striking conclusions with regard to the later period need not concern us here.) In this article, I would like to reconsider this matter from a slightly different point of view. I propose in it, however, to adopt a criterion which is nowadays becoming somewhat unusual: not only to confine myself to strictly contemporary testimony, but moreover to assume that the contemporaries meant exactly what they said.[1]

There is overwhelming evidence that human images, whether in the flat or in the round, were not tolerated by the Jews in the period before the destruction of Jerusalem. We may leave out of account in this connection the frenzied opposition in A.D. 37 to Caligula's order to have his statue erected in the Temple and the synagogues for religious veneration: obviously, there was no possibility of compromise on this point. But we know of many other cases at this period which show clearly that the objection prevailed even where worship was not in question. Thus, the commotion which resulted when Pilate introduced to Jerusalem at night the

[1] The non-Rabbinic evidence has been assembled by J. B. Frey, La question des images chez les juifs, in BIBLICA, xv (1934) 265–300: there is no need for me therefore to recapitulate it. It is also considered minutely by Goodenough in his Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period, referred to in the text: cf. now also Boaz Cohen, Art in Jewish Law, in JUDAISM, iii. (1954) 165–176.

military standards bearing the *imperatorum imagines*, the busts or medallions of Caesar, was so unanimous that he decided to withdraw them.[2] Again, apparently even the assimilated Jews who participated in the public games did not like the idea of trophies in the form of images, and were relieved when they found that Herod had substituted a wooden framework behind the armor.[3] On the other hand, it is probable that this feeling of opposition was stimulated by political resentments, without which it might have been less uncompromising. It is significant surely that the only coin struck by a Jewish ruler for circulation in Palestine bearing his own portrait is one of Herod Agrippa I, the popular, nationalist, religiously observant King: for he could permit himself liberties impossible for his unpopular grandfather, Herod the Great.[4] Yet, if we are to take quite literally the story of Jesus and the Tribute Penny (Matthew xxii. 15–22 &c.), we see that even the religious, hyper-nationalist element in the country had at this time no deep-rooted objection to handling and gazing on coins bearing a human effigy: unlike the pious third-century Rabbi Nahum (or Menahem) ben Simai, who gained the title of 'holy' among his contemporaries because he would not so much as look at a coin which bore any sort of effigy.[5] The difference of outlook in this matter between the first century and the third seems to be reflected also in the fact that, whereas Josephus describes only the political intransigeance of the Zealots (Wars ii. 118; Antiquities xviii. 23) the Church Father Hippolytus (in his Omnium Haeresium Confutatio, ix. 26) adds to this that (in his time?) they would not handle or look on any coin which bore an image.

On the other hand, there is not so far as I can discern any positive contemporary evidence that there was in the period we are here considering (that is, before the great Revolt against the Romans in 66–70) a complete and effective Rabbinic ban on non-

[2] Josephus, Wars, ii. 169–174: Antiquities, xviii. 55–59. No doubt the Jewish opposition was intensified by the 'loyal' obligation to show respect to the Imperial symbol.

[3] Antiquities, xv. 267 ff.

[4] A. Reifenberg, Portrait Coins of the Herodian Kings, in NUMISMATIC CIRCULAR, 1935: Ancient Jewish Coins (2nd ed., Jerusalem 1947), pp. 20–21.

[5] 'Jerusalem' Talmud, Aboda Zara, 42c, and Megilla, 72b: cf. H. M. J. Loewe, Render Unto Caesar (Cambridge 1940) pp. 87–88, and E. Bevan, Holy Images (London 1940) pp. 60–61.

human effigies for decorative (as distinct from religious) purposes. In the second century B.C., the palace built by Hyrcanus the son of Joseph in Transjordan had 'beasts of gigantic size carved on it': and Josephus reports this (Antiquities, xii. 230) without any expression of censure. According to him, the Jews protesting to Petronius, at the time of Caligula's deplorable attempt in A.D. 37, insisted that they were forbidden 'to place an image of God, much more of a man, not only in their sanctuary, but even in any unconsecrated spot' (Wars ii. 195) — but did not mention any non-human likenesses: though to be sure this evidence should not perhaps be interpreted so strictly. Most categorical is a statement of a second-century Rabbi, Lazar (Eleazar) ben Simeon, to the effect that 'all likenesses [a form of the Greek word προσώπον is used] were to be found in Jerusalem (before the destruction in A.D. 70) except those of human beings.'[6] It is true that this is in the course of a discussion regarding the use of signet rings, but from the phraseology it would not seem that the Rabbi had only these in mind: moreover, it was the accepted view that in this case there were additional objections, because in sealing a man created a new impression, thus contravening more specifically the Biblical prohibition (Exodus xx. 4) to 'make' a graven image.[7]

The evidences for the complete prohibition of figurative art of any sort in Palestine before 70 seem to be purely literary: one might perhaps say, literary exercises. In the first place, there are various *obiter dicta* of Josephus: e.g. in his condemnation of Solomon for putting the images of bulls and lions in the Temple (Ant. viii. 195). We will revert to this point: it is enough for me to say now that I propose to adduce evidence to show that he adopted a stricter attitude during the course of his public career, reflected in the writings composed after his retirement. Philo, on the other hand, seems to be curiously reticent regarding this whole question. In his principal writings, he barely touches on it.[8] The outstanding passage to the contrary effect is casually included in De Gigantibus xiii. 59, in which he inconspicuously remarks that Moses banned painting and sculpture from his commonwealth,

[6] TJ Aboda Zara, loc. cit.

[7] Ibid.

[8] His attitude is closely examined by E. R. Goodenough in By Light, Light (New Haven 1935) pp. 256–259.

since their artistry belied truth. This does not convey much sense of conviction or reality, and it has been pointed out [9] that there seems to be here an echo of Plato's ideal commonwealth, in which some forms of poetry were to be banned on similar grounds. Indeed, Philo shows elsewhere a keen sense of artistic appreciation.[10] We may add to this evidence a few passages from the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphic writings. Plainly, these show an uncompromising enmity to image worship, but figurative art is otherwise hardly mentioned. An exception is the passage in the Wisdom of Solomon (xv. 4), which objects to painting rather anaemically and academically, not on basic grounds but because 'it leadeth fools to lust' (a reference as is believed to the story of Pygmalion). A diatribe in chapter xiv (verses 12–21) apparently assails likenesses because in the end they became the objects of worship. Even in these two cases, however, the objection seems to be to the delineation of human beings, not of animals, the only categorical and unmistakable condemnation of which in this period is as I believe that of Josephus to which reference has already been made.

We now come to the famous episode in 4 B.C. which is recounted twice in slightly varying terms by Josephus, in Wars i. 650 and Ant. xvii. 151. There were two σοφισταὶ or teachers, Judah son of Saraphaeus (in Wars Sepphoraeus: perhaps therefore 'of Sepphoris') and Matthias son of Margolos, 'profound experts in the laws of their country' who were active in Jerusalem at this time, attracting to their lectures large audiences of pupils, both youths and men of mature age: we may consider them Pharisees of the extreme wing, belonging to what is termed the first generation of Tannaim, though they are not mentioned in the Rabbinic literature. At the time of Herod's last sickness, they began to teach that the golden eagle which he had erected over the great gate of the Temple was contrary to Jewish law, and incited their pupils to tear it down. According to them, we are informed, 'It was in fact unlawful to place in the Temple either images or busts or any representation whatsoever of a living creature.' If

[9] By the editors of the Loeb Classics edition, ii. 504, and Goodenough, op. cit. pp. 256–259.

[10] Goodenough, ibid.

we interpret this passage quite literally, we have to admit the logical corollary that in their opinion this was considered legitimate outside the Temple. In any case, it seems that the objection to the eagle, obviously felt deeply by the people because it was a Roman symbol, was placed formally on religious grounds by these two teachers, who asserted that it was contrary to Mosaic law. Had this been felt universally from the beginning, it would assuredly not have been left to these otherwise-unrecorded 'sophists' to express the opposition, after it was erected. It is perhaps significant that we hear nothing of any objection aroused by Herod's inclusion of an eagle on one of his coins, earlier in his reign.

The ultimate outcome of the extremist teaching is familiar. A number of youths hacked down the eagle with axes, were arrested, and were barbarously put to death, together with the two Rabbis who had incited this action. It is easy to imagine that the latters' doctrine, far from disappearing, would now have become as it were a basic principle in patriotic circles, even among those who were formerly more moderate, and that when the opportunity arose it would have been formally enacted and thus become part of the Pharisaic code. That I suggest is precisely what happened. For the evidence, it is necessary to skip an entire generation.

In 66, shortly after the revolt against the Romans and the re-establishment of independence, Josephus was sent by the Revolutionary junta in the capital to assume command in Galilee. Not long after his arrival, he informed the local authorities at Tiberias that he and his associates had been commissioned by the Jerusalem assembly (ὑπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Ἱεροσολυμιτῶν) to press for the demolition of the palace erected by Herod the Tetrarch, which contained representations of animals: such a style of architecture being forbidden by the Laws (Life, § 65). It is notorious that there were in Galilee leaders more patriotic and more zealous than Josephus, and if the decoration of the Palace of the unpopular ex-royal house in fact contravened Jewish law as they understood and had learned it, it is improbable that they would have waited so long as this to take steps: nor does Josephus record that any objection had been raised earlier. What is more, an influential section of the population of the city, led by Julius Capella (a Jew notwithstanding his name), was at first opposed to the iconoclastic

action, which clearly therefore did not represent the established and recognized religious tradition as it had prevailed hitherto. It seems therefore that the ban on the representation of animals, even for decorative purposes and in private houses, had been formulated very recently, and that Josephus now brought the official report of it, together with instructions that it should be implemented.

Reexamining the passage in the light of this suggestion, we find that he states this pretty well in as many words. A few lines before the passage just quoted (§ 62), he remarks that he had written for instructions to the Sanhedrin in Jerusalem, or of the men of Jerusalem (*τῳ συνεδρίῳ τῶν Ἱεροσολυμιτῶν*): he is certainly referring to this same body when he says that the instructions for the demolition of the Palace came from the Jerusalem assembly (*ὑπο τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Ἱεροσολυμιτῶν*). This body is spoken of again (Life, § 310) as being ultimately responsible for appointments and dismissals. Elsewhere (§ 7) he calls them the *πρῶτοι*. Whether the apparent synonym employed, 'sanhedrin,' is to be taken in its generally-accepted sense need not detain us here: the constitution of the Revolutionary State of 66–70 is a subject which still requires study. One point, however, may be emphasized. We do not know much about the composition of the body in question, but one of its most influential members according to these passages and Wars iv. 159 was the Pharisee leader Simon ben Gamaliel, who according to later tradition was president of the Rabbinic Sanhedrin. It was obviously therefore something more than a merely political body, as indeed was inevitable in the circumstances of the age.

I suggest that the natural interpretation of the passage I have quoted from Josephus' Autobiography is that shortly after the expulsion of the Romans the Revolutionary Assembly, presumably meeting as usual in the Temple court, passed a religious ordinance confirming the teaching of the martyred Rabbis Judah and Matthias and condemning the use of images, animal as well as human, even in the decoration of private dwellings. Naturally, this measure would have been all the more popular since the persons mainly affected were the pro-Roman aristocracy. Josephus, who had himself taken part in meetings of this 'Sanhedrin,' was

instructed, when he assumed command in Galilee, to communicate this decision in that province and to see that it was put into effect. Obviously, R. Lazar ben Simeon's statement that 'all likenesses were to be found in Jerusalem, except those of human beings,' would refer to the anterior period of Roman rule, not to this brief and stormy interlude: the fact that he was an avowed pro-Roman, who might for that reason have objected to the iconoclastic revolutionary legislation, could perhaps have some bearing on the question.

A new restrictive prohibition of this type would be termed in Rabbinic usage an Ordinance (גזרה). We are informed in the Talmud of a series of such Ordinances, traditionally eighteen in number, which were enacted as it seems in the period immediately preceding the Revolt of 66.[11] In the main, they consisted of religious boycotts on a number of commodities (wine, oil and so on) when produced by Gentiles: the cumulative result envisaged being an almost complete interruption of any sort of intercourse in any manner whatsoever between Jew and non-Jew.[12] The precise period is uncertain, and the details are to some extent blurred and confused. But an Ordinance against figurative representations of any description in the Roman style, even of animals and even in private houses, would obviously not have been alien to the spirit of the times.[13] It may be observed that Josephus displayed great interest (not to say zeal) in the enforcement of the ban on Gentile oil, which in some accounts was one of the series of Ordinances referred to above, and which according to him (Life, § 74–75) was

[11] Mishnah, Sabbath i. 4 (and Tosefta, ibid., i. 15) with the corresponding passages in the Gemara (TB Sabbath 13b–14a, 15a–b, 17a, and TJ Sabbath f. 3c: also TB Aboda Zara 36a): the ultimate authority is as it happens R. Simeon b. Johai, father of the R. Lazar b. Simeon mentioned above.

[12] The question of the 'eighteen ordinances' and their date is minutely considered by H. Graetz, Geschichte der Juden, iii. note 26 and subsequently from differing points of view by Z. Frankel. I. H. Weiss, I. Halevy, Z. Javitz, and most recently J. Klausner (all in Hebrew): cf. also G. Foot Moore, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era, i. 81, and Encyclopaedia Judaica, i. 741–746. Graetz identifies the inspirer of the code with the Revolutionary leader Eleazar.

[13] It appears to me conceivable that these regulations may all be attributable to the same occasion, in the year 66, to which I refer. I imagine that it would be fanciful to suggest that the reference to a ban on ציר (= brine) may be a corruption of ציור (= figure): or to draw wider implications from the strange statement (TB Sabbath 17a) that the controversy which raged concerning this legislation was as disastrous as the making of the Golden Calf in the Wilderness.

neglected by John of Gischala, the patriot leader in Galilee: conceivably, more from ignorance that it had come into force than (as Josephus vindictively asserts) from 'knavery.'

That such an iconoclastic ordinance was passed by the Revolutionary 'Sanhedrin' in Jerusalem in 66 explains, I venture to suggest, the attitude towards art expressed by Josephus throughout his writings: and the fact throws some light perhaps on his own psychology. Notwithstanding his subsequent apologetic attitude, he never really repudiated the Revolution of 66, which he depicts with much sympathy and in which he actively participated. He merely considered that it went too far. The extremists, not he, betrayed the Revolution, in his view: and up to the point where they parted company he accepted it. A 'Pharisee of the Pharisees' himself, he accepted likewise, inevitably, the religious legislation of its early stages, in the discussion and enactment of which he had presumably taken some part himself. Hence in his writings he reflects, so far as his attitude towards art is concerned, the iconoclastic attitude of the first flush of revolutionary enthusiasm. In this, he goes well beyond anything in the Rabbinic sources of the early period. Thus, in paraphrasing the Ten Commandments, he states outright (Ant. iii. 91): 'The Second [Commandment] enjoins us to make no image of any living creature,' though to be sure he adds 'for adoration.' In Against Apion (ii. 74 f.) he justifies the Jewish refusal to set up statues of the Emperors on the grounds that 'our master forbade the making of images . . . of any living creature.' He goes out of his way to say that there was nothing representing the forms of animals on the tapestry before the gate of the Sanctuary constructed in the wilderness (Ant. iii. 113) and that the curtain before the Holy of Holies was 'interwoven with all the designs that could lend to its adornment, save only the forms of living creatures' (ib. 126): while he minimizes the iconic significance of the cherubim by observing that these winged creatures were 'in form unlike any that man's eyes have seen' (ib. 137). Most significantly of all, he censures King Solomon for putting the images of bulls and lions in the Temple, this being the deplorable sin of which he was guilty even before he took strange wives (Ant. viii. 195). In this, Josephus shows himself more rigid than the Rabbis of the Talmudic period, in

whose writings we find no condemnation of this action. That Josephus does not speak in derogatory terms of the adornments of the palace of Hyrcanus is not remarkable, for the latter does not appear by any means as an ideal figure. But it is perhaps significant that, since this was before the suggested Ordinance of 66, it would not in fact have been against the law, in the same sense as it would have been at a later date. In any case, an equally high standard of observance could hardly have been expected from a political adventurer as from the wisest of mortals. Here Josephus is describing an actuality, not postulating an ideal.

In view of all the above, I venture to suggest that the anti-iconic (rather than iconoclastic) tendency in Judaism reached its climax in the second half of the first century of the Christian era, at the time of the great Revolt against Rome and the fleeting reestablishment of independence. The legislation imposing this was brought to its culminating point by the 'Sanhedrin' which met in the Temple Court, with the participation of priests, Pharisaic teachers, and political leaders, in the autumn of A.D. 66. Some time later on, well after the destruction of Jerusalem and the partial acceptance of the Roman way of life by the Jewish people, a liberal reaction temporarily set in, which expressed itself in the decorations of the Galilean synagogues, the mosaics of their floors, and the frescoes of Dura and the catacombs of Beth Shearim. This, however, is far beyond my present scope.

PROCLUS AND PSEUDO-NILUS

Amongst the homilies ascribed to Proclus, one-time bishop designate of Cyzicus and later bishop of Constantinople (434–46), there is included one of which the subject is the Ascension of Christ.[1] The first section of this sermon was transcribed, with the omission of a few sentences, by Photius in his Bibliotheca; [2] he assigned it, however, not to Proclus but to Nilus, an ex-Prefect of Constantinople who had embraced the monastic life and retired to the deserts of Sinai in the first decade of the fourth century. The problem of authorship thus presented can only be determined upon internal evidence, since no other references to this sermon have been preserved.

Proclus, it will be recalled, played an important part in the inauguration of the Nestorian controversy, for his panegyric 'on the Virgin mother of God,' [3] delivered on Lady Day, 429, was in effect an attack upon the teaching of Nestorius' domestic chaplain, Anastasius. Nestorius himself proceeded to defend his subordinate's views, which he shared, in a series of sermons, and it was the circulation of these that brought Cyril of Alexandria into the fray. The Ascension homily with which we are concerned bears one unmistakable trace of this controversy. Its author permits himself to enunciate the anti-Nestorian catch-phrase: 'God was born of a Virgin' (*ἔσχεν Θεὸν τὸν τεχθέντα ἐκ Παρθένου*).[4] This phrase exactly represents Proclus' own teaching. Thus in the panegyric which had done so much to foster the dispute, he referred to *ὁ ἐκ Παρθένου τεχθεὶς Θεὸς καὶ ἄνθρωπος*.[5] In a further encomium on the Virgin we find the statement: *ἔτεχεν ἡ Παρθένος τὸν Κύριον*,[6] while in his Tome, a celebrated doctrinal epistle written in 435, he affirmed: *ἔτεχε Θεὸν ἡ Παρθένος*.[7] Intimately connected with this is the further affirmation, in the panegyric: *ὁ αὐτὸς ὢν ἐν τοῖς κόλποις τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ ἐν γαστρὶ Παρθένου*.[8] To the same effect the homilist declares: *ἕως ἐν κόλποις τοῦ Πατρὸς ὑπεδέχθη ὁ μὴ χωρισθεὶς τοῦ Πατρός ποτε*.[9] More-

[1] P.G. 65.833–7.
[2] Ed. Hoeschelius, 1653, col. 1536 (P.G. 79.1497–1500).
[3] Orat., 1 (P.G. 65.679–92).
[4] P.G. 65.836A.
[5] Orat., 1.6 (P.G. 65.685D).
[6] Orat., 6.10 (P.G. 65.737D).
[7] Ep., 2.12 (P.G. 65.868C, cf. 860D).
[8] P.G. 65.689C.
[9] Ibid. 836D.

over since Nilus died c. 430, i.e. before the Nestorian controversy was well under way, we should maintain that this affirmation of the Theotokos position accords more readily with the authorship of Proclus.

There is, however, a further consideration which may serve to make this identification certain. In the Ascension homily the word φύσις is used of Christ's humanity.[10] Cyril of Alexandria did not generally speak of the Lord's humanity as a 'Nature.'[11] He employed φύσις either of the Lord's divine Person[12] or of the Godhead in Christ. It was Proclus, as we may learn from his Tome,[13] who used φύσις of Christ's manhood, so paving the way for the Chalcedonian definition of one Person 'in two Natures.' Since the homilist's use of φύσις is identical with that of Proclus in his Tome, we may therefore conclude that the ascription of this sermon to him is reasonably definite.

Finally, it may be noted that the recognition that the Pseudo-Nilus fragment preserved by Photius is all but identical with the opening section of a genuine homily by Proclus enables us to supply a lacuna in the text of the latter. Thus instead of κατενεχθέντες . . . ὥτεροι διὰ πτώματος ἔστημεν[14] in Proclus, we should read with Pseudo-Nilus κατενεχθέντες, ἤρθημεν εἰς ὕψος,[15] ὥτεροι διὰ πτώματος ἔστημεν.

The fragment that Photius thus falsely assigns to Nilus is not the only extract that he purports to have made from the latter's works. He has also transcribed sections from two further Ascension homilies which he equally attributes to the same author.[16] Since therefore Photius is mistaken in his ascription of the first fragment, the question naturally arises whether or not his ascription of these two other extracts is not also at fault.

The first of these two additional excerpts is very brief and has no distinctive stylistic features to enable us to arrive at any definite conclusion as to authorship. The second quotation, however, is much longer and does contain those same two elements which have enabled us above to determine the provenance of the complete sermon, viz. the Theotokos doctrine and the use of φύσις of Christ's humanity. So, on the one hand, the author of this extract affirms: Παρθένος τίκτει;[17] and,

[10] Ibid.

[11] There is one example in his sermon at Ephesus, delivered immediately prior to his arrest in July 431; Conc. Eph., Actio vi. No. 7 (Mansi iv.1369E).

[12] E.g., Ep. 46.2 (P.G. 77.241B).

[13] Ep. 2.5, 9 (P.G. 65.860D, 864C, D).

[14] P.G. 65.833B.

[15] P.G. 79.1497D.

[16] Ed. Hoeschelius, cols. 1536–40 (P.G. 79,1500–01).

[17] P.G. 79.1501A.

on the other, Συμβασιλεύει Θεότητι φύσις.[18] This suggests, even though it does not entirely prove, that Photius has been consistent in his misattributions and that this fragment, and with it possibly the second one also, like the complete sermon, comes from the pen of Proclus of Constantinople.

J. G. Davies

The University
Birmingham, England

[18] Ibid., 1501C.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Die Apostelgeschichte, Neu Uebersetzt und Erklaert *von D. Ernst Haenchen*. . . Goettingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956. 665 p. fold. map. (Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar ueber das Neue Testament. Begruendet von Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer. 3. Abteilung. 10 Auflage)

Calls. [*By*] *Frank Peto*. Houston, Texas, Frank Hajos [1956]. 49 p.

The Christology of Theodoer of Mopsuestia. *By Francis A. Sullivan*. . . Romae, Apud Aedes Universitatis Gregoriannae, 1956. viii, 299 p. (Analecta Gregoriana, Vol. LXXXII, Series Facultatis Theologicae, Sectio B (n. 29)

De La Mort a la Resurrection, d'après l'Ancien Testament. [*Par*] *Robert Martin-Achard*. Neuchatel, Delachaux & Niestlé [1956]. 187 p.

Es El Arte Una Mascara Tragica? [*De*] *Luis Farré*, Ministerio de Educacion de la Nacion, Universidad Nacional de Tucuman. Departamento de Extension Universitaria, n.d. 41 p. (Cuadernos de Extension Universitaria, 7)

Los Evangelios Apocrifos; Colección de textos Griegos y Latinos, Versión Crítica, Estudios Introductorios, Commentarios e Ilustraciones, *por Aurelio de Santos Otero*. . . Madrid. Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1956. xvi, 761 p. plates.

Geneva and the Coming of the Wars of Religion in France 1555–1563. Genève, Librairie E. Droz, 1956. 161 p. (Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance, XXII)

An Historian's Approach to Religion: Based on Gifford Lectures Delivered in the University of Edinburgh in the Years 1952 and 1953. *By Arnold Toynbee*. London, New York, Toronto, Oxford University Press, 1956. ix, 318 p.

Das Hohe Lied Das Buch Hiob; Eine Rhythmische unde Textkritische Untersuchung Nebst Einer Einfuehrung in das Hohe Lied: *von D. Arvid Bruno*. Stockholm, Almqvist & Wiksell [1956]. 192 p.

Jesus; *by Charles Alfred Honoré Guignebert*. New York, University Books, 1956. xii, 563 p.

Luke the Physician, and Other Studies in the History of Religion. *By W. M. Ramsay*. Grand Rapids, Michigan, Baker Book House, 1956. xiv, 418 p. (Baker Reprint Library)

Man at Work in God's World; Paper Delivered at the Church and Work Congress Held in Albany, New York, October 19–20, 1955. *Edited by Canon G. E. DeMille*. . . Longmans, Green and Co., New York, 1956. xviii, 205 p.

The Migration of Symbols. [by] *Eugène Félicien Albert Goblet d'Alviella*. New York, University Books, [1956]. xxiii, 275 p.

The Truth that Frees; [by] *Gerard Smith*. . . Milwaukee, Marquette University Press, 1956. 79 p. (The Aquinas Lecture, 1956) (Under the auspices of the Aristotelian Society of Marquette University)

Twenty-Five Firsts in Man's Recorded History from the Tablets of Sumer. [By] *Samuel Noah Kramer.* . . Indian Hills, Colorado, Falcon's Wing Press [1956]. xxv, 293 p.

Utopia Y Realidad En El Erasmismo Espanol. [De] *Octavio Corvalan.* Ministerio de Educación de la Nacion, Universidad Nacional de Tucuman. Departamento de Extension Universitaria, n.d. 41 p. (Cuadernos de Extension Universitaria, 11)